MARION TWO SCHOOL DISTRICT P.O. Box 689 Mullins, SC 29574 PK-12 GRADES 2.160 Students ENROLLMENT R. Jerry Leviner, Ph.D. 843-464-3700 SUPERINTENDENT BOARD CHAIR Mr. Samuel McMillan 843-464-3700 FISCAL AUTHORITY District Board/County Board/Referendum THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2003 ANNUAL DISTRICT REPORT CARD ABSOLUTE RATING: AVERAGE Absolute Ratings of Districts with Students like Ours Excellent Good Average Below Average Unsatisfactory IMPROVEMENT RATING: AVERAGE ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: N/A SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL By 2010, South Carolina's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country. FOR MORE INFORMATION, VISIT WEBSITES AT: WWW.MYSCSCHOOLS.COM WWW.SCEOC.ORG

PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Average	Average	N/A
2002	Below Average	Below Average	N/A
2003	Average	Average	N/A

PALMETTO ACHIEVEMENT CHALLENGE TESTS (PACT) RESULTS

Definition of Critical Terms

Advanced

Very high score; very well prepared to work at next grade level; exceeded expectations

Proficient

Well prepared to work at next grade level; met expectations

Basic

Met standards; minimally prepared, can go to next grade level

Did not meet standards; must have an academic assistance plan; the local board policy determines progress to the next grade level

NOTE: Science and social studies are to be included in the 2005 school report card.

TENTH GRADE PASSA	GE OF ONE	OR MORE	SUBTES	TS OF TH	IE EXIT E	XAM
		Our Distri	ct	Distri	icts with Stud Like Ours	dents
Percent	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
Passed all 3 subtests	58.7	55.3	61.9	53.9	53.9	50.6
Passed 2 subtests	21.0	23.5	16.5	18.7	19.8	20.8
Passed 1 subtest	11.9	10.6	15.5	15.9	14.1	16.1
Passed no subtests	8.4	10.6	6.2	11.4	12.1	12.3

ELIGIBILITY FOR LIFE SCHOLARSHIP	s	
Percent of	Our District	Districts with Students Like Ours
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions*	7.0	5.4
Seniors who met the SAT requirement	7.7	5.4
Seniors who met the grade point average	42.0	39.1

^{*}Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

Subsidized meals

Full-pay meals

PACT PERFORMANCE BY GROUP

PACT PERFORMANCE	BY GR	Rent 1st ind						
		d 1st ting	/	asic	/	ient	~ced	cientand Advanced
		Jell Lest	rester /	ONPT	o Basic ol	orofic.	Myal.	cienyanco
	Emo	194, 0/0	lested old	alon Basic	0/0	Proficient of	Advanced on Profi	cient and street
			Ξī	nglish/Lar	nguage A			
All students	1,007	99.2	41.7	43.8	13.5	1.0	14.6	17.6
Gender								
Male	527	98.9	48.0	38.9	12.4	0.7	13.1	17.6
Female	480	99.6	34.8	49.0	14.8	1.4	16.1	17.6
Racial/Ethnic Group								
White	259	98.8	32.2	43.0	23.0	1.9	24.8	17.6
African-American	739	99.3	45.4	43.4	10.4	0.8	11.1	17.6
Asian/Pacific Islander		0.0						17.6
Hispanic	7	100.0	10.0	80.0	10.0		10.0	17.6
American Indian/Alaskan	1	100.0						17.6
Disability Status								
Not disabled	765	99.3	35.6	45.7	17.4	1.4	18.7	17.6
Disabled	242	98.8	60.8	37.7	1.5		1.5	17.6
Migrant Status								
Migrant		0.0						17.6
Non-migrant	1,007	99.2	41.7	43.7	13.6	1.0	14.6	17.6
English Proficiency	1,001							
Limited English proficient	1	100.0						17.6
Non-limited English proficient	1,006	99.2	41.9	43.5	13.6	1.0	14.7	17.6
Socio-Economic Status	1,000	00.2	1110	10.0	1010	110		
Subsidized meals	809	99.3	44.6	44.3	10.8	0.3	11.1	17.6
Full-pay meals	187	99.5	28.5	41.5	25.9	4.1	30.1	17.6
• •	1 101	00.0					,	,
				Mathe	matics			
All students	1,007	99.9	41.2	45.7	8.9	4.2	13.1	15.5
Gender								
Male	527	99.8	40.9	45.6	9.6	3.9	13.5	15.5
Female	480	100.0	41.7	45.7	8.1	4.5	12.6	15.5
Racial/Ethnic Group	100	10010		1011	311		12.10	
White	259	100.0	30.1	47.1	14.7	8.1	22.8	15.5
African-American	739	99.9	45.4	44.9	6.8	2.9	9.7	15.5
Asian/Pacific Islander		0.0						15.5
Hispanic	7	100.0	10.0	70.0	20.0		20.0	15.5
American Indian/Alaskan	1	100.0	10.0	1 0.0	20.0		20.0	15.5
Disability Status		100.0						10.0
Not disabled	765	99.9	35.6	47.8	11.2	5.4	16.6	15.5
Disabled	242	100.0	58.5	39.2	1.9	0.4	2.3	15.5
Migrant Status	272	. 50.0	55.5	30.2	1.0	J.,		70.0
Migrant		0.0						15.5
Non-migrant	1,007	99.9	41.4	45.5	8.9	4.2	13.1	15.5
English Proficiency	1,007	30.0		.0.0	3.0			10.0
Limited English proficient	1	100.0						15.5
Non-limited English proficient	1,006	99.9	41.2	45.6	9.0	4.2	13.2	15.5
Socio-Economic Status	1,000	55.5		10.0	0.0		10.2	10.0
Cubaidizad maala	000	00.0	44.0	45.5	7.1	2.5	0.0	45.5

Abbreviations for Missing Data

44.6

25.9

45.5

46.6

7.4

15.5

2.5

11.9

9.9

27.5

15.5

15.5

809

99.9

100.0

PACT PERFORMANCE BY GRADE LEVEL

	Enroll	BAJOT 0/6	16 010 B	ol.	2ps / 0/2	6, 0%	AL 0/0 Profi
	/ • •			n/Langua	ge Arts		
Grade 3	153		41.8	40.5	16.3	1.3	17.6
Grade 4	148		27.1	58.3	13.9	0.7	14.6
Grade 5	173		30.2	59.9	9.3	0.6	9.9
Grade 5 Grade 6	169		39.1	44.1	15.5	1.2	16.8
Grade 7	184		38.9	55.6	5.6		5.6
Grade 8	143		43.7	45.8	9.9	0.7	10.6
▲ Grade 3	154	98.7	33.6	46.2	19.6	0.7	20.3
Grade 4	156	98.1	45.7	40.4	13.2	0.7	13.9
g Grade 5	159	99.4	40.7	50.0	8.0	1.3	9.3
Grade 5 Grade 6	187	100.0	33.3	46.8	17.0	2.9	19.9
Grade 7	176	99.4	53.0	34.5	11.3	1.2	12.5
Crada 9	175	99.4	50.0	44 0	6.0		6.0

			M	athematic	S		
▲ Grade 3	153		43.8	44.4	7.2	4.6	11.8
Grade 4	148		31.3	51.4	13.2	4.2	17.4
Grade 5	173		30.1	49.1	12.1	8.7	20.8
Grade 5 Grade 6	169		48.1	37.5	10.6	3.8	14.4
Grade 7	184		60.1	33.3	6.0	0.5	6.6
Grade 8	143		59.9	34.5	4.2	1.4	5.6
▲ Grade 3	154	99.4	36.8	50.0	10.4	2.8	13.2
Grade 4	156	100.0	32.5	55.2	8.4	3.9	12.3
g Grade 5	159	100.0	34.4	48.3	9.3	7.9	17.2
Grade 5 Grade 6	187	100.0	34.5	44.4	16.4	4.7	21.1
Grade 7	176	100.0	61.9	28.6	4.8	4.8	9.5
Grade 8	175	100.0	45.8	49.4	2.4	2.4	4.8

STATE PERFORMANCE ON NATIONAL TESTS

Terra Nova: a national, norm-referenced achievement test.

		Percentage of students scoring in the upper half, 2002											
	Rea	ding	Lang	uage	Ma	ath	To	tal					
Grade	State	Nation	State	Nation	State	Nation	State	Nation					
3	49.2	50.0	51.5	50.0	58.2	50.0	54.8	50.0					
6	57.6	50.0	49.0	50.0	51.2	50.0	51.4	50.0					
9*	56.1	50.0	46.8	50.0	51.6	50.0	51.2	50.0					

^{*} Grade 9 estimates were based on a sample that may not be representative of the entire 9th grade population.

National Assessment of Educational Progress: a national, criterion-referenced achievement test.

				Percent of students scoring							
			Adva	anced	Prof	cient	Ba	sic	Below	/ Basic	
Test	Grade	Year	State	Nation	State	Nation	State	Nation	State	Nation	
Reading	8	2002	1	3	23	30	44	43	32	25	
Writing	4	2002	1	2	16	26	65	58	18	14	
Mathematics	8	2000	2	5	15	22	37	38	45	34	

PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS

	Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2003			y for LIFE arships*	Graduation Rate	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
All Students	132	93.9%	143	7.0%	162	72.2%
Gender						
Male	62	93.5%	72	5.6%	78	70.5%
Female	69	94.2%	71	8.5%	84	73.8%
Race or Ethnic Group						
African American	85	90.6%	103	2.9%	116	67.2%
Hispanic	1	I/S	1	I/S	1	I/S
White	45	100.0%	39	17.9%	44	86.4%
Other	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	1	I/S
Disability Status						
Non-speech disabilities	2	I/S	15	0.0%	25	0.0%
Students without disabilities	130	93.8%	128	7.8%	0	85.4%
Migrant Status						
Migrant	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Non-migrant	2	I/S	143	7.0%	11	99.0%
English Proficiency						
Limited English proficient	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Non-LEP	132	93.9%	143	7.0%	162	72.2%
Lunch Status						
Subsidized meals	75	89.3%	92	1.1%	98	70.4%
Full-pay meals	57	100.0%	51	17.6%	64	75.0%

^{*} Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

2002-2003 College Admissions Tests

SAT	Ver	bal	Ma	ath	То	tal	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	
District	436	467	459	482	895	949	
State	488	493	493	496	981	989	
Nation	504	507	516	519	1020	1026	

ACT	Eng	lish	Ma	ıth	Rea	ding	Scie	nce	To	tal
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
District	14.7	14.6	16.6	16.3	16.1	15.3	16.1	16.6	16.0	15.8
State	18.8	18.7	19.1	19.0	19.3	19.4	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2
Nation	20.2	20.3	20.6	20.6	21.1	21.2	20.8	20.8	20.8	20.8

SCHOOLS IN "SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STATUS"

n = number of students on which percentage is calculated

	Our District	Change from Last Year	Districts with Students Like Ours	Media Distric
Students (n= 2,160)				
First graders who attended full-day kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Retention rate	0.4%	Down from 9.8%	5.8%	4.0%
Attendance rate Meeting grade 1 & 2 readiness standards	95.7% N/A	Up from 94.9% N/A	95.1% N/A	95.4% N/A
Eligible for gifted and talented On academic plans	5.1% N/A	Down from 6.0% N/A	6.1% N/A	10.7% N/A
On academic probation With disabilities other than speech	N/A 15.7%	N/A Down from 16.3%	N/A 10.5%	N/A 10.6%
Older than usual for grade Suspended or expelled	11.0% 2.3%	Up from 9.4% Down from 2.4%	6.8% 1.6%	5.5% 1.6%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs Successful on AP/IB exams	8.2% N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	10.0% N/A
Enrolled in adult education GED or diploma programs	187	Up from 110	187	186
Completions in adult education GED or diploma programs	27	Up from 25	27	40
Teachers (n= 139)				
Teachers with advanced degrees Continuing contract teachers	33.1% 87.8%	No change Up from 87.2%	43.5% 80.1%	47.8% 82.8%
Highly qualified teachers Teachers returning from previous year	N/A ar 86.3%	N/A Up from 85.0%	N/A 86.3%	N/A 89.5%
Teacher attendance rate Average teacher salary	95.3% \$36,755	Up from 95.1% Up 0.3%	94.4% \$38,290	95.1% \$39,70
Prof. development days/teacher	11.2 days	Up from 10.8 days	12.6 days	11.3 day
District				
Superintendent's years at district Student-teacher ratio	5.0 22.4 to 1	Up from 4.0 Up from 19.9 to 1	2.0 19.8 to 1	3.0 20.6 to
Prime instructional time Dollars spent per pupil*	89.8% \$7,559	Up from 89.1% Up 1.4%	87.5% \$8,549	89.0% \$7,412
Percent spent on teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts	52.9% Good	Up from 49.0% No change	53.9% Good	56.0% Exceller
Parents attending conferences Number of schools	88.2% 5	Down from 89.7% No change	92.1% 5	96.1%
Number of magnet schools Number of charter schools	0	No change No change	0 0	(
Portable classrooms Average age in years of school facility	0.6% y 33	Down from 2.8% N/A	4.9% 36	3.5% 20
Number of schools with SACS accreditation	5	N/A	4	1
* Prior year audited financial data are reported.		Our Dis	strict Sta	te
Highly qualified teachers in low pover	ty schools	N/A	N/A	4
Highly qualified teachers in high pove	erty schools	N/A	A N/.	Ą
A	bbreviations	s for Missing Data		

SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNANCE

Board Membership

7 trustees elected to at-large seats

Fiscal Authority

District Board/County Board/Referendum

Average Number of Hours of Training Annually 8.0 per board member

Percent new trustees completing orientation N/A

DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Marion School District Two serves the educational needs of over 2100 students in a population base of 13,000 residents. Located in a small rural area of the Pee Dee, the district operates five schools on six sites with 150 teachers. Approximately 80 percent of our students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. Over 40 percent of the families live below the poverty level and have a taxable income of less than eight thousand dollars. Marion County continues to rank near the top in the state in unemployment.

Despite the economic barriers, our students excel in comparison to similar districts. This is due partially to the Mullins community partnership with the school district whose goal is to provide a better life for our children. Towards this end, the district's strategic and school renewal plans focus on providing a quality education that challenges students in academics, athletics and fine arts.

Four schools in the district have gained recognition by the National Resource Center for Safe Schools as a School of Promise Flagship Award winner. Resource officers are housed at our high school and junior high school in order to promote a safer learning environment. The implementation of honors classes at all of our schools has been instrumental in improvement on PACT scores and SAT scores. The community through the Mullins Chamber of Commerce has endorsed the Character Education Program in our schools. They annually recognize this partnership by inviting Mullins High School students of exceptional character as guests at one of their monthly meetings.

The main focus of the Marion School District Two's Board of Trustees is to foster the development of a well-rounded individual that will someday become a productive citizen and community member. The board recognizes that this can only be accomplished through the support of our community as well as our legislative delegation.

R. Jerry Leviner, Ph.D., Superintendent

DEFINITIONS OF DISTRICT RATING TERMS

- Excellent District performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Good District performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average District performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
 Below Average District is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the
- 2010 SC Performance Goal

 Unsatisfactory District performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal